UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,218	08/29/2000	Albert M. Avery IV	004609.P002	9822

7590 03/09/2005

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
CHEN, SHIN HON	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/650,218	AVERY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shin-Hon Chen	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 26-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 26-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 August 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/19/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19, 26-30 have been examined.

Drawings

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because some characters in drawings are difficult to read. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10, 26-29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puchek et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6496595 (hereinafter Puchek) in view of Gravlin U.S. Pat. No. 6353853 (hereinafter Gravlin) and further in view of Daigneault et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020029349 (hereinafter Daigneault).

5. As per claim 1, 26, and 27, Puchek discloses an Internet co-location facility security system, comprising:

a. Plurality of biometrics readers (Puchek: column 5 line 63 – column 6 line 17);

b. An access control system coupled to the plurality of biometrics readers (Puchek: column 6 line 44 – column 7 line 40);

c. A computer including a central software program connected to the access control system, the central software program configured to monitor the use of the plurality of biometrics readers (Puchek: column 6 line 44 – column 7 line 40);

d. A server including a database connected to the central software program, the database configured to receive information from the central software program regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers by a visitor associated with a co-located member during a visit to the co-location facility (Puchek: column 7 lines 21-40 and column 9 line 40 – column 10 line 40).

However, Puchek does not explicitly disclose

e. Transmit this information through the Internet to a web-based interface; and

f. the web-based interface further configured to allow co-located members to schedule visits to the facility through the Internet to the database on the server.

However, Gravlin discloses using the Internet to control building automation system that is responsible for all of the environmental aspects of a facility including security (Gravlin: column 1 lines 6-64 and column 2 line 32 – column 3 line 13: enable authorized users to monitor, control, configure, and interact with he BAS… enabled to locally or remotely manage). Since the Puchek discloses the monitoring information and access control information can be transmitted

to database/server through Internet and use for statistic or other purposes, the monitoring information obtained from the access control system can be downloaded by the server and transmitted to web-based remote clients to control and manage building remotely for reasons as building maintenance and security purposes. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Gravlin within the system of Puchek because it allows authorized users to monitor and control a building remotely through Internet and cut down the cost of security personnel.

Puchek as modified does not explicitly disclose scheduling visit to the facility. However, Daigneault discloses access control system that compares the visitor's ID and also the authorized schedule of visit (Daigneault: [0004]: the scheduler determines if the user can access the premise at that particular time). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow remote scheduling of access to a facility because access control based on authorized schedule is a security aspect of a facility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Daigneault within the combination of Puchek-Gravlin because it provides more secure access to a facility.

6. As per claim 2 and 28, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1 and 26 respectively. Puchek further discloses including an input device coupled to each of the plurality of biometrics readers for entry of a visitor identification code of a visitor, a match between the visitor identification code and the visitor's personal

identification characteristics triggering the access control system to allow the visitor to gain access to designated areas in the facility (Puchek: column 2 lines 4-18 and column 5 lines 7-20).

7. As per claim 3 and 29, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 2. Puchek further discloses wherein the access control system further includes a transmitter for transmitting the information regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers to the central software program, the information regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers including the visitor identification code and the date anal time the visitor used one or more of the plurality of biometrics readers (Puchek: column 9 line 62 – column 10 line 40).

8. As per claim 4, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1. Puchek as modified further disclose wherein information regarding the scheduled visits transmitted by the co-located members through the Internet to the database on the server includes the date, time, expected duration of a scheduled visit, and a visit identification number for the scheduled visit (Daigneault: [0002]-[0005]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Daigneault within the combination of Puchek because it allows the access control system to not only authenticate users based on biometric parameters but also on schedules.

9. As per claim 5, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the server further includes a

transmitter for transmitting information regarding the scheduled visits to the central software program through a network (Daigneault: [0002]-[0005]). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 4.

10. As per claim 6, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1. Puchek further discloses including a front entrance biometrics reader for initial access to the facility, the use of the front entrance biometrics reader triggering the central software program to transmit information regarding the use of the front entrance biometrics reader to a lobby workstation (Puchek: column 8 lines 18-56).

11. As per claim 7, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1. Puchek as modified further disclose including a user interface for triggering the central software program to combine a visitor identification code with a visit identification number for the scheduled visit (Daigneault: [0002]-[0004]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art co combine the teachings of Daigneault within the combination of Puchek-Gravlin because it allows the system to authenticate the user according to his/her identification along with the schedule to allow access.

12. As per claim 8, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 7. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the user interface authorizes a visitor to progress through the remainder of the facility using the plurality of biometrics readers

(Puchek: column 5 line 63 – column 6 line 17: plurality of local access control system; Daigneault: [0002]-[0013]).

13. As per claim 9, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 1. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein information regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers is transmitted by the central software program through the network to the database on the server (Puchek: column 9 line 62 – column 10 line 40) and the information including a visitor identification code, a visit identification number for the scheduled visit, and the date and time a visitor used any one of the plurality of biometrics readers (Daigneault: [0002]-[0013]). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 7.

14. As per claim 10, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 9. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the co-located members may access the information in the database regarding a visitor's use of the plurality of biometrics readers by using the web-based interface accessible from one or more remote computer terminals connected to the Internet (Gravlin: column 1 lines 6-64 and column 2 line 32 – column 3 line 13). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 1.

15. As per claim 30, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claims 26. Puchek as modified further disclose the information transmitted to the database on the server where it is accessible to co-located members from one or more remote computer terminals connected to the Internet (Gravlin: column 1 lines 6-64; column 2 lines 32 –

column 3 line 13) and the central software program combines a visit identification number with the information regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers from the access control system (Daigneault: [0009]-[0013]). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 7.

16. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puchek in view of Gravlin and further in view of Schmitt et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5903225 (hereinafter Schmitt) and further in view of Daigneault.

17. As per claim 11, Puchek discloses an Internet co-location facility security system, comprising:

a. A computer including a central software program connected to the access control system, the central software program configured to monitor the use of the plurality of other biometrics readers (Puchek: column 5 line 63 – column 6 line 17 and column 6 line 44- column 7 line 40);

b. A server including a database connected to the central software program, the database configured to receive information from the central software program regarding the use of the plurality of biometrics readers (Puchek: column 7 line 21-40 and column 9 line 40 – column 10 line 40).

Puchek does not explicitly disclose

c. Transmitting this information to co-located members through the Internet;

d. and a web-based interface configured to allow co-located members to schedule visits to the facility through the Internet to the database on the server.

However, Gravlin discloses using the Internet to control building automation system that is responsible for all of the environmental aspects of a facility including security (Gravlin: column 1 lines 6-64 and column 2 line 32 – column 3 line 13). The monitoring information obtained from the access control system can be downloaded by the server and transmitted to web-based remote clients for monitoring. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Gravlin within the system of Puchek because it allows authorized users to monitor and control a building remotely through Internet and cut down the cost of security personnel.

The combination of Puchek-Gravlin does not explicitly discloses an enrollment biometrics reader; and an access control system coupled the enrollment biometrics reader and to a plurality of other biometrics readers. However, Schmitt discloses that limitation (Schmitt: column 2 line 37 – column 3 line 57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Schmitt within the combination of Puchek-Gravlin because it allows a person to access an area if that person is not already registered user by allowing on-site enrollment.

Puchek as modified does not explicitly disclose scheduling visit to the facility. However, Daigneault discloses access control system that compares the visitor's ID and also the authorized schedule of visit (Daigneault: [0004]: the scheduler determines if the user can access the premise at that particular time). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow remote scheduling of access to a facility because access control based on authorized schedule is a security aspect of a facility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of

Daigneault within the combination of Puchek-Gravlin-Schmitt because it provides more secure access to a facility.

18. As per claim 12, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 11. Puchek as modified further discloses including an imaging device to record an image of a personal characteristic of a visitor not previously enrolled in the security system, the image of the personal characteristic stored on a storage device in the enrollment biometrics reader (Schmitt: column 2 line 37 – column 3 line 57). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 11.

19. As per claim 13, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 12. Puchek as modified further discloses including an input device coupled to the enrollment biometrics reader for matching a stored image of the visitor's personal characteristic with a visitor identification code entered into the enrollment biometrics reader through the input device (Puchek: column 2 lines 4-18).

20. As per claim 14, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 13. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the enrollment biometrics reader transmits a stored image matched with a visitor identification code to the plurality of other biometrics readers located in the facility through a private security network (Puchek: column 2 lines 4-18 and column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 20).

21. As per claim 15, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 11. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein a visitor may be enrolled in the access control system by entering the visitor information into an input device coupled to the access control system (Schmitt: column 2 line 37 – column 3 line 57). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 11.

22. As per claim 16, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 11. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein a stored image matched with a visitor identification code from the enrollment biometrics reader and identification information from the access control system is download by the central software program, the central software program transmitting the information through the Internet to the database on the server (Puchek: column 9 line 62 – column 10 line 40).

23. As per claim 17, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 16. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the database transmits the information from the central software program through a network to a database on a server in one or more other facilities (Gravlin: column 1 lines 6-64 and column 2 line 32 – column 3 line 13). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 11.

24. As per claim 18, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 17. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the database transmits the information through the network to an access control system and through a private security

network to a plurality of biometrics readers in one or more other facilities, the information transmitted by the database automatically enrolling the visitor on the access control system and the plurality of biometrics readers in the one or more other facilities (Puchek: column 7 line 41 – column 8 line 17).

25. As per claim 19, Puchek as modified discloses the Internet co-location facility security system of Claim 18. Puchek as modified further discloses wherein the visitor uses the plurality of other biometrics readers to gain access to designated areas in the facility, the information regarding the use of the plurality of other biometrics readers including the visitor identification code, a visit identification number, and the date and time the visitor used one or more of the plurality of other biometrics readers (Daigneault: [0009]-[0028]). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 7.

Response to Argument

26. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 and 26-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Vossler U.S. Pat. No. 6614450 discloses information display system for scheduling the utilization of a facility.

Seeley et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6097429 discloses site control unit for video security system

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100